Design Evaluation

[Preece, Chaps 29-34; Hix, Chap 10; Neilsen, Chap 6-7]

Why evaluate?

Understand the problem

Compare designs

Fine-tune an engineering solution

Checking performance against usability specifications

Usability Specifications

When you perform an evaluation, how will you know if the level of usability is acceptable for general human use or not? You must determine beforehand what the usability specifications are. These are *measurable* so that the results of your evaluation can be compared against them. (See Figure 36.)

Usability Attributes

include:

- Initial performance
- Long-term performance
- Learnability
- Retainability
- Advanced feature use
- First impression
- Long-term user satisfaction

The specification should provide a:

- worst acceptable level,
- a planned target level,
- a current level, and
- a best possible level for each item.

Reasonable measurable values include:

- Time to complete a task
- Number or percentage of errors
- Percentage of task completed in a given time
- Ratio of successes to failures
- Time spent in errors and recovery
- Number of commands/actions used to perform tasks
- Frequency of help and documentation use
- Number of repetitions of failed commands
- Number of available commands not invoked
- Number of times user expresses frustration or satisfaction

Formative versus Summative Evaluation

Formative evaluation is a type of usability evaluation performed early and continuously throughout development; its purpose is to assess and improve the user interface design.

December 1, 1996 Page 43 of 50

				Worst	Planned	Roct	
Usability Attribute	Measuring Instrument	Value to be Measured	Current Level	Acceptable Level	Target Level	Possible Level	Observed Results
Initial performance	"Add appoint- ment" task per Benchmark 1	Number of errors on first trial	0 errors (manually)	3 errors	2 errors	0 errors	
Initial performance	"Search for appointment" task per Benchmark 4	Length of time to successfully search for appointment	2 minutes (manually)	30 seconds	20 seconds	15 seconds	
Initial performance	"Delete appointment" task per Benchmark 2	Length of time to successfully delete appoint- ment on first trial	12 seconds	20 seconds	12 seconds	8 seconds	
Learnability	"Add appoint- ment" task per Benchmark 5	Length of time to successfully add appointment after one hour of use	15 seconds (manually)	15 seconds	12 seconds	8 seconds	
First	User reaction	Number of negative/positive remarks during session	??	10 negative/ 2 positive	5 negative/ 5 positive	2 negative/ 10 positive	

Figure 36.

Summative evaluation, in contrast, is typically performed after a system or user interface is more or less complete; its purpose is to statistically compare several different systems or interfaces, for example, to determine which one is 'better' — where better is defined in advance.

December 1, 1996 Page 44 of 50

Neither type of evaluation is more formal than the other; they just have different purposes. Formative evaluation is the type that ensures usability of interactive systems.

Steps in Performing an Evaluation

- 1. Develop the experiment
- 2. Direct the evaluation session
- 3. Collect the data
- 4. Analyze the data
- 5. Draw conclusions to form a resolution for each identified design problem
- 6. Redesign and implement the revised interface

Develop the Experiment

- Select participants to perform the tasks
- Develop tasks for participants to perform
- Determine protocol and procedures for the evaluation sessions
- · Pilot testing to shake down the experiment

Select Participants

Select a representative set of people who you think will be the typical users of the system. These people will give you your best feedback of what works and what doesn't.

Be careful not to select participants that may know too much about the interface being studied. People who have an idea what you might be studying will behave differently from those who regard it as a simple working system. This does not imply that novice users are always best. It is often a good idea to select people who are at least a little familiar with the problem domain.

Develop Tasks

The evaluator's copy of the task list. (See Figure 37.)

The participant's copy of the task list (See Figure 38.)

Determine Protocol and Procedures

(See attached Human Subjects Procedure)

- Protocol: exactly what are you going to do
- Consent form: participants know what is expected of them
- Debriefing: background on the experiment

Within government supported research, these procedures must be adhered to when the use of human subjects is involved.

Pilot Testing

The earliest pilot testers are usually the design team or experimenters themselves. This is an acceptable practice to reach a reasonable level of operability and usability. You don't want to start with a system that is extremely far from an acceptable solution if it can be helped.

Subsequent pilot testing involves running one or two participants through the experimental procedure in an informal way to determine if the procedure is appropriate and if the data collected will satisfy the needs of the study.

December 1, 1996 Page 45 of 50

Benchmark 1 (measure task performance time, count number of errors):

A. Schedule a meeting with Dr. Ehrlich for four weeks from today at 10 A.M. in 133 McBryde, concerning the HCI research project.

Intervening nonbenchmark tasks:

- B. Schedule an appointment for a physical exam with the vet for Pumpkin the cat on October 31.
- C. Change the phone appointment with your book editor on Monday, December 1 at 1 $_{\rm P.M.}$, to a meeting with Sam Smith about the usability lab.
- D. To keep you from forgetting it, put an alarm on the meeting with Dr. Ehrich,

Benchmark 4 (measure task performance time):

E. Find your next appointment with the dentist.

Intervening nonbenchmark tasks:

- F. Change the dentist's appointment you just found to the first available Tuesday morning (allow two hours) in May.
- **G.** Schedule one week of vacation for the whole week during which the Fourth of July falls next year.

Benchmark 2 (measure task performance time, count number of errors):

H. Suppose that you have decided not to spend money on your dog. Delete your appointment with the vet for Mutt's annual checkup.

Intervening nonbenchmark task:

I. Look to see how many appointments you will have to cancel if you extend your vacation by another week.

Free use (to build up total usage time to at least one hour):

J. Play around with the system, exploring anything you would like to in the Calendar Management System, for as long as you would like to.

Benchmark 5 (measure task performance time):

K. Schedule an appointment for car maintenance on January 3 next year.

Benchmark 3 (measure task performance time):

Enter a one hour weekly meeting with the HCI group every Wednesday at 9 A.M. for one year, beginning on the Wednesday of next week.

Final task:

M. Add in the schedule for your HCl class, which meets every Tuesday during spring semester (January through May) from 2:00 to 3:30 P.M.

Figure 37.

Types of Evaluation Data

- *Objective*: These are directly observed measures, typically of user performance while using the interface to perform benchmark tasks.
- Subjective: These represent opinions, usually of the user, concerning usability of the interface.
- Quantitative: These are numeric data and results, such as user performance metrics or opinion ratings. This kind of data is key in helping to monitor convergence toward usability specifications during all cycles of iterative development.
- Qualitative: These are non-numeric data and results, such as lists of problems users had while using the
 interface, and they result in suggestions for modifications to improve the interaction design. This kind of data is
 useful in identifying which design features are associated with measured usability problems during all cycles of
 iterative development.

A common misconception is that quantitative measures are associated with objective measures and qualitative measures are associated with subjective measures. This is not the case.

December 1, 1996 Page 46 of 50

- A. Schedule a meeting with Dr. Ehrich for four weeks from today at 10 A.M. in 133 McBryde, concerning the HCl research project.
- **B.** Schedule an appointment for a physical exam with the vet for Pumpkin the cat on October 31.
- **C.** Change the phone appointment with your book editor on Monday, December 1 at 1 P.M., to a meeting with Sam Smith about the usability lab.
- D. To keep you from forgetting it, put an alarm on the meeting with Dr. Ehrich.
- E. Find your next appointment with the dentist.
- F. Change the dentist's appointment you just found to the first available Tuesday morning (allow two hours) in May.
- **G.** Schedule one week of vacation for the whole week during which the Fourth of July falls next year.
- **H.** Suppose that you have decided not to spend money on your dog. Delete your appointment with the vet for Mutt's annual checkup.
- 1. Look to see how many appointments you will have to cancel if you extend your vacation by another week.
- J. Play around with the system, exploring anything you would like to in the Calendar Management System, for as long as you would like to.
- K. Schedule an appointment for car maintenance on January 3 next year.
- L. Enter a one hour weekly meeting with the HCl group every Wednesday at 9 A.M. for one year, beginning on the Wednesday of next week.
- M. Add in the schedule for your HCl class, which meets every Tuesday during spring semester (January through May) from 2:00 to 3:30 P.M.

Figure 38.

Ouantitative Measures

- Benchmark tasks (See Figure 39.)
- User questionairres (See Figure 40.)
- Post-Hoc Analyses (In-situ data logs)

PARTICIPANT ID:	Session Date: Session Start Time: Session End Time:							
Task Description	Tape Counter	No. of Errors	Elapsed Time	Participant's Actions and Comments	Evaluator's Observations			
A Schedule appt								
В								

Figure 39.

Qualitative Measures

- Direct observation
- Concurrent verbal protocols
- Retrospective verbal protocols Video/Audio tapes
- Critical incident taking
- Structured interviews

December 1, 1996 Page 47 of 50

	hard to rea	~						easy to read	
Characters on screen		2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	N
or arabicis or soroon	fuzzy	_	_		-			sharp	
Image of characters	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
	barely legible	e						very legible	
Character shapes (fonts)	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	1
								_	
Was highlighting on the	not at all				_		_	very much	
screen helpful?	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
	unhelpful	_			_	,	-	helpful 8 9	١
Use of reverse video	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	• .	1
	unhelpful	_	_		_		-	helpful	
Use of blinking	1	2 	3	4	5 - -	-6 	7	8 9 	
Were screen layouts helpful?	never							always	
were screen layours neiprain	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
Amount of information	inadequate		•	-	•	•	•	adequate	
that can be displayed	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	1
Arrangement of	illogical							logical	
Information on screen	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
Sequence of screens	confusing							clear	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
Next screen in sequence	unpredictab	le						predictable	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
Going back to previous									
screen	impossible	_	_		-	,	-	easy	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
Beginning, middle, and									
end of tasks	confusing		_		-	,	-	clearly marke	
		2 	3_		5 - -	6 ———	7 — — —	8 9	4
Overall reactions to	terrible							wonderful	
the system:	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
ii ie sysiei ii.	frustratina		Ū	•	•	-	•	satisfying	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
	dull	_	•		-			stimulating	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
•	difficult	_	-	•	-			easy	
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	١
	inadequate p		•					adequate po	wer
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8 9	1
	rigid							flexible	١

Figure 40.

Analyzing the Data

(See Figure 41.)

Resolving usability problems based on the results of your study. (See Figure 42.)

December 1, 1996 Page 48 of 50

	Initial performance		Initial performance		Initial performance		Initial performance	Usability Attribute	
	"Delete appoint- ment" task per Benchmark 2		"Delete appoint- ment" task per Benchmark 2		"Add appoint- ment" task per Benchmark 1		"Add appoint- ment" task per Benchmark 1	Measuring Instrument	
	Number of errors on first trial	trial	Length of time to successfully delete appoint-		Number of errors on first trial	trial	Length of time to successfully add appoint-	Value to be Measured	
	0 errors		12 seconds		0 errors (manually)		15 seconds (manually)	Current Level	
	4 errors		20 seconds		3 errors		30 seconds	Worst Acceptable Level	141
	3 errors		12 seconds		2 errors		20 seconds	Planned Target Level	נייייןמ
	0 errors		8 seconds		0 errors		10 seconds	Best Possible Level	Bank
Mean= 4.3 errors	P1=5 P2=5 P3=3	Mean= 54 seconds	P1=71 secs P2=42 secs P3=50 secs	Mean= 2.3 errors	P1=2 P2=4 P3=1	Mean = 35 seconds	P1=33 secs P2=42 secs P3=29 secs	Observed Results	

Figure 41.

December 1, 1996 Page 49 of 50

Problem	Effect on User Performance	Importance	Solution(s)	Cost	Resolution
User dld not know to select appointment before It could be deleted	115 of 163 seconds	High	Move delete button, gray it out until user selects appoint- ment, and add message to user	5 hours	
User can get to future years only by moving successively through months	N/A	Medium	Add navigation tabs for "future year" and "past year"	2 hours	
User did not understand need to drag the alarm icon to the desired appointment	N/A	High	When user clicks on alarm icon, change cursor to look like alarm icon, then user moves cursor to desired appointment and single-clicks to add an alarm	2 hours	

Figure 42.

December 1, 1996 Page 50 of 50